

REMARKS

Claims 64-78, and 80-94 are pending in this application, with claims 65 and 69-78, and 80-89 being withdrawn. By this Amendment, claims 64 and 90 are amended for further clarity, claim 79 is canceled, and claims 91-94 are added. No new matter is added.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Castellano in the March 1 and 2 telephone interviews. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

I. Rejoinder of Claims

Claims 65, 69-78, and 80-89 are indicated to be withdrawn. However, as discussed during the March 2 telephone interview, Applicants have elected Fig. 6A, but Figs. 2, 3, and 6A are similar and were discussed during the March 1 telephone conference. Examiner Castellano has agreed to enter and consider claims generic to these three embodiments or directed specifically to elected Fig. 6A. Additionally, withdrawn dependent claims 72-77 and 80-89 are revised to depend directly from generic claim 64 and read on the elected species. Accordingly, claims 72-77 and 80-89 must be rejoined and considered. Additionally, because independent claim 64 is generic and allowable for the reasons discussed below, all of the remaining withdrawn claims must be rejoined and allowed in accordance with MPEP §821.04.

II. Pending Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claims 64, 68 and 90 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,308,427 to Duhaime et al. (Duhaime) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,902,425 to Kuznia. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 64 and 90 are amended to more particularly specify the shape (form) and function of the insert. Both claims are generic to embodiments illustrated in Applicants' Figs. 2, 3, 6A, and 6B.

As discussed during the March 1 telephone interview, neither Duhaime nor Kuznia have an insert with a form enabling an attachment to be mounted after the tank has been molded with the insert captive in the wall of the tank. In Duhaime, fixing of the attachment takes place while molding the tank by deforming core 24 to give it its final deformed mushroom shape. Kuznia's insert is not used or shaped for mounting of an attachment. Rather, the sensing cell is bonded to it with adhesive (col. 3, lines 32-37).

Additionally, the insert in Duhaime once covered provides a cylindrical protrusion extending upward that is received within an opening of element 28 and retained by deforming of the protrusion into a mushroom shape. Thus, as discussed, if the metal insert of Kuznia were used in Duhaime, the metal deformation would likely damage the overlying plastic layer. Accordingly, there would have been no motivation to use a metal layer since Kuznia is not concerned with such problems because his metal insert does not undergo deformation.

Moreover, as also discussed, the Duhaime insert has a shape that does not form a recessed opening, and does not have a wall portion of thermoplastic material that covers the recessed opening to form an internal housing that enables mounting of the attachment in the formed internal housing, such as by snap-fit or friction fit. Kuznia fails to overcome this deficiency.

Accordingly, independent claims 64 and 90 and the claims dependent therefrom distinguish over Duhaime and Kuznia. Additionally, Duhaime and Kuznia fail to teach or suggest a snap-fit or friction fit mounting as in claims 74, 75, and new claims 92 and 93, or a mounting achieved by an interior opening having a diverging wall as recited in new claims 91 and 94 and shown in Figs. 1 and 7. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 66 and 67 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Duhaime and Kuznia, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,952,347 to Kasugai. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Kasugai fails to overcome the deficiencies of Duhaime and Kuznia with respect to independent claim 64. Accordingly, dependent claims 66 and 67 are allowable for their dependence on allowable base claim 64 and for the additional features recited therein. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



William P. Berridge
Registration No. 30,024

Stephen P. Catlin
Registration No. 36,101

WPB:SPC/jnm

Date: March 6, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
